



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,313	06/22/2001	Jean-Christophe Denis Bandini	TUMB-102CIP	7984

26137 7590 10/21/2005

PATENT DEPARTMENT  
SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP  
FOUR TIMES SQUARE  
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER

CALLAHAN, PAUL E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/887,313

Applicant(s)

BANDINI ET AL.

Examiner

Paul Callahan

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4/18/05 PC

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Claims 1-15 were pending in the application at the time of the previous Office Action. Claims 1-7 have been cancelled via the latest amendment. Claims 8-15 remain pending and have been examined.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 6-24-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Landfield '011 fails to teach comparison of a signature and consequent transmission of an intercepted e-mail based upon a predetermined result. Yet such was not asserted to be taught by Landfield in the previous Office Action. Kent was found to teach these features at page 4 paragraphs 1-4.

The balance of the applicant's arguments are rendered moot by the changes made to the language of the claims by the latest amendment.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 8-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landfield '011 in view of Kent: "Privacy Enhancements for Internet Electronic Mail"

As for claim 8, Landfield teaches a e-mail filtering method (abstract) comprising: a security manager receiving an e-mail message from a remote server (col. 4 lines 52-56), (The) e-mail message associated with at least one recipient identifier (fig. 2C: element 56). Kent teaches the features not found in Landfield, namely: the e-mail message including signature data (page 4 paragraphs 3-4), the security manager extracting the signature data from the e-mail message (page 4 paragraphs 3-4), verifying the signature data by accessing a signature verification server (page 4, paragraphs 3-4), the security manager transmitting the e-mail message to at least one recipient identifier in response to at least one predetermined result of said verifying (page 4 paragraphs 3-4). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features of Kent into the system of Landfield. It would have been desirable to do so as such signature verification would increase the security of the e-mail transmission.

As for claim 13, Landfield does not teach determining if a signature is required for the received e-mail message by applying a signature policy; retrieving a signing certificate for the message in response to said applying a signature policy by reference to a signature policy; applying the retrieved signing certificate to the message; and forwarding the message; for further processing by the e-mail firewall. Kent however,

does teach these features in page 4 paragraphs 1-4. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features of Kent into the system of Landfield. It would have been desirable to do so as the use of a certificate server would increase the security of the system by allowing verification of user's public keys.

As for claims 9-12, 14, and 15, the language of these claims has not been changed via the latest amendment and therefore no changes are necessitated in the rejections of these claims. The text of the rejections will not be repeated herein, but instead are incorporated in their entirety by reference to the previous Office Action in the case. The applicant is referred to the previous Office Action for the text of the rejections.

### ***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2137

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

10/12/05

*Paul Callahan*

*Matthew Smithers*  
MATTHEW SMITHERS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
*Art Unit 2137*